

## REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending. Claims 1, 8, 10, 16 and 20 have been amended. No new matter has been added as a result of the amendments.

### 102 Rejection

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Alden (U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0038928). Applicant has reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as is recited in Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14 and 15 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Alden (U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0038928).

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 1 which recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to a display projection system that includes:

...an optical component to provide collimation of said beam, wherein said data is viewable via a projected display and said display projection system is implementable in a portable electronic device, and wherein functions of said projected display to be performed are selectable by tilting said display projection system.

Independent Claims 10 and 16 recite limitations similar to those of Claim 1. Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 9 depend from independent Claim 1, and Claims 14 and 15 depend from independent Claim 10 and recite further limitations of the Claimed invention.

Alden does not anticipate or render obvious a display projection system comprising an image generator for providing a beam and an optical component that provides a projected display wherein “functions of said projected display to be performed are selectable by tilting said display projection system” as is recited in Claims 1 and 10. In order to meet the limitations of these Claims a reference must teach or suggest, either expressly or inherently,

along with other recited limitations of the claims: (1) a projected display that includes selectable functions; where (2) the functions of the projected display are selectable by tilting a display projection system that projects the display.

Alden only shows a remote image projector for hand held and wearable applications. Alden teaches that the therein disclosed handheld projector includes a means that senses when the handheld projector moves relative to an image projected thereby. As such, the Alden system is concerned with tracking the movement of the handheld projector and not with using the movement of the handheld projector to select functions provided in a projected image. In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner has equated the image stabilization functionality disclosed by Alden to the function selecting functionality of the Applicant's invention as is set forth in Applicant's claims. The Applicant respectfully submits that these functionalities are fundamentally different. Alden discloses no image component that represents a selectable function that when selected triggers operations that effect a stabilization of a projected image. The image stabilization functionality provided by the Alden system is triggered by the simple movement of a hand held system and not (as set forth in Applicants claims) by the selection of any graphically rendered objects that are presented as a part of the image that is projected by the handheld system. This basic deficiency of the Alden reference evidences the stark technical differences between the system disclosed by Alden and the embodiments of the Applicant's invention as set forth in the claims. These fundamental differences preclude the use of Alden to anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention.

In summary, nowhere in the Alden reference is a projection system that comprises an image generator that provides a beam and an optical component that provides a projected display wherein "functions of said projected display to be performed are selectable by tilting said display projection system" as is recited in Claims 1 and 10 taught or suggested. Consequently, the embodiments of Applicant's invention as set forth in Claims 1 and 10 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Alden.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Alden does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the present Claimed invention as are recited in independent Claims 1 and 10, and as such Claims 1 and 10 overcome the Examiner's basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 1 and 10 are in condition for allowance. In addition, Alden does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the present invention as are recited in Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 14 and 15 which depend from independent Claims 1 and 10 respectively. Therefore, Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 14, and 15 are also in condition for allowance as being dependent on allowable base Claims.

### 103 Rejection

Claims 2 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alden (U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0038928) in view of Albers et al. (U.S. Patent 4,505,558). Applicant has reviewed the cited references and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as are recited in Claims 2 and 11 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Alden (U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0038928) in view of Albers et al. (U.S. Patent 4,505,558).

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 1 which recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to a display projection system that includes:

...an optical component to provide collimation of said beam, wherein said data is viewable via a projected display and said display projection system is implementable in a portable electronic device, and wherein functions of said projected display to be performed are selectable by tilting said display projection system.

Independent Claim 10 recites limitations similar to those of Claim 1. Claim 2 depends from independent Claim 1 and Claim 11 depends from independent Claim 10 and recite further limitations of the Claimed invention.

Alden does not anticipate or render obvious a display projection system comprising an image generator for providing a beam and an optical component that provides a projected display wherein “functions of said projected display to be performed are selectable by tilting said display projection system” as is recited in Claims 1 and 10 (from which Claims 2 and 11 respectively depend). In order to meet the limitations of these Claims a reference must teach or suggest, either expressly or inherently, along with other recited limitations of the claims: (1) a projected display that includes selectable functions; where (2) the functions of the projected display are selectable by tilting a display projection system that operates to project the display.

Alden only shows a remote image projector for hand held and wearable applications. Alden teaches that the therein disclosed handheld projector includes a means that senses when the handheld projector moves relative to an image projected thereby. As such, the Alden system is concerned with tracking the movement of the handheld projector and not with using the movement of the handheld projector to select functions provided in a projected image. In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner has equated the image stabilization functionality disclosed by Alden to the function selecting functionality of the Applicant’s invention as is set forth in Applicant’s claims. The Applicant respectfully submits that these functionalities are fundamentally different. Alden discloses no image component that represents a selectable function that when selected triggers operations that effect a stabilization of a projected image. The image stabilization functionality provided by the Alden system is triggered by the simple movement of the disclosed hand held system and not by the selection of any graphically

rendered objects that are presented as a part of the projected image. This basic deficiency of the Alden reference precludes its use to anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention.

In summary, nowhere in the Alden reference is a projection system that comprises an image generator that provides a beam and an optical component that provides a projected display wherein “functions of said projected display to be performed are selectable by tilting said display projection system” as is recited in Claims 1 and 10 (from which Claims 2 and 11 respectively depend) taught or suggested. Consequently, the embodiments of Applicant’s invention as set forth in Claims 2 and 11 (dependent on Claims 1 and 10 respectively) are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Alden.

Albers et al. does not overcome the shortcomings of Alden noted above. Albers et al. does not anticipate or render obvious a display projection system comprising an image generator that provides a beam and an optical component that provides a projected display wherein “functions of said projected display to be performed are selectable by tilting said display projection system” as is recited in Claims 1 and 10 (from which Claims 2 and 11 respectively depend). Albers et al. only discloses a method of modifying projected images. As such, Albers et al. is concerned with the modification of projected images and does not teach providing selectable functions therein. Nowhere in the Albers et al. reference is a projection system that comprises an image generator that provides a beam and an optical component that provides a projected display wherein “functions of said projected display to be performed are selectable by tilting said display projection system” shown or suggested as is recited in Claims 1 and 10 (from which Claims 2 and 11 respectively depend). Consequently, the embodiments of the Applicant’s invention as set forth in Claims 2 and 11 (dependent on Claims 1 and 10 respectively) are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Alden and Albers either alone or in combination.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Alden and Albers, either alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the present Claimed invention as are recited in independent Claims 1 and 10 and as such Claims 1 and 10 overcomes the Examiner's basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 1 and 10 are in condition for allowance. In addition, Alden and Albers, either alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the present invention as are recited in Claim 2 and 11 which depend from independent Claims 1 and 10 respectively. Therefore, Claims 2 and 11 are also in condition for allowance as being dependent on allowable base Claims.

Claims 5, 8, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alden (U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0038928) in view of Gibeau et al. (U.S. Patent 5,614, 961). Gibeau et al. does not overcome the shortcomings of Alden noted above. Nowhere in the Gibeau et al. reference is a projection system that comprises an image generator for providing a beam and an optical component that provides a projected display wherein "functions of said projected display to be performed are selectable by tilting said display projection system" shown or suggested as is recited in Claims 1 and 10 (from which Claims 5, 8, 12, and 13 depend). Consequently, the embodiments of Applicant's invention as set forth in Claims 5, 8, 12 and 13 are neither anticipated or rendered obvious by Alden in view of Gibeau et al.

Claims 16, 19, 21-23 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alden (U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0038928) in view of Lichtfuss (U.S. Patent Application 2002/0175915). Lichtfuss does not overcome the shortcomings of Alden noted above. Nowhere in the Lichtfuss reference is a projection system that comprises an image generator for providing a beam and an optical component that provides a projected display wherein "functions of said projected display to be performed are selectable by tilting said display projection system" shown or suggested as is recited in Claim 16 (from which

Claims 19, 21-23 and 25-27 depend). Consequently, the embodiments of Applicant's invention as set forth in Claims 16, 19, 21-23 and 25-27 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Alden and Lichtfuss either alone or in combination.

Claims 17 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alden (U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0038928) in view of Lichtfuss (U.S. Patent Application 2002/0175915) and further in view of Gibeau et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,614,961). Gibeau et al. does not overcome the shortcomings of Alden and Lichtfuss noted above. Nowhere in the Gibeau et al. reference is a projection system that comprises an image generator for providing a beam and an optical component that provides a projected display wherein "functions of said projected display to be performed are selectable by tilting said display projection system" shown or suggested as is recited in Claim 16 (from which Claims 17 and 24 depend). Consequently, the embodiments of Applicant's invention as set forth in Claims 17 and 24 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Alden, Lichtfuss and Gibeau et al., either alone or in combination.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alden (U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0038928) in view of Lichtfuss (U.S. Patent Application 2002/0175915) and further in view of Albers et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,505,558). Albers et al. does not overcome the shortcomings of Alden and Lichtfuss noted above. Nowhere in the Albers et al. reference is a projection system that comprises an image generator for providing a beam and an optical component that provides a projected display wherein "functions of said projected display to be performed are selectable by tilting said display projection system" shown or suggested as is recited in Claim 16 (from which Claim 18 depends). Consequently, the embodiment of Applicant's invention as set forth in Claim 18 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Alden, Lichtfuss and Albers et al. either alone or in combination.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alden (U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0038928) in view of Lichtfuss (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0175915) and further in view of Medl (U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0045998). Medl does not overcome the shortcomings of Alden and Lichtfuss noted above. Nowhere in the Medl reference is a projection system that comprises an image generator for providing a beam and an optical component that provides a projected display wherein "functions of said projected display to be performed are selectable by tilting said display projection system" shown or suggested as is recited in Claim 16 (from which Claim 20 depends). Consequently, the embodiment of Applicant's invention as set forth in Claim 20 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Alden, Lichtfuss and Medl either alone or in combination.

#### Conclusion


In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully respectfully requests allowance of the remaining Claims.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: 11/12/, 2004

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John P. Wagner  
Registration No. 35,398  
Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
(408) 938-9060